

**North American Numbering Council  
Meeting Minutes  
March 19, 2003 (Final)**

**I. Time and Place of Meeting.** The North American Numbering Council held a meeting commencing at 9:00 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW-C305, Washington, D. C.

**II. List of Attendees.**

Voting Council Members:

- |                         |                          |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Robert Atkinson      | Chairman                 |
| 2. Teresa Gaugler       | ALTS                     |
| 3. Pamela Connell       | AT&T                     |
| 4. Randy Sanders        | BellSouth                |
| 5. Hon. Jack Goldberg   | NARUC                    |
| 6. Hon. Loretta Lynch   | NARUC                    |
| 7. Hon. Elliott Smith   | NARUC                    |
| 8. Philip McClelland    | NASUCA                   |
| 9. Beth O'Donnell       | NCTA                     |
| 10. Christopher Bowe    | Nextel                   |
| 11. David Bench         | Nortel Networks          |
| 12. John McHugh         | OPASTCO                  |
| 13. C. Courtney Jackson | OUR                      |
| 14. Mark Welch          | SBC Communications, Inc. |
| 15. Hoke Knox           | Sprint                   |
| 16. Michele Thomas      | T-Mobile USA, Inc.       |
| 17. Thomas Soroka, Jr.  | USTA                     |
| 18. Michael O'Connor    | Verizon                  |
| 19. Karen Mulberry      | WorldCom                 |

Special Members (Non-voting):

- |                 |       |
|-----------------|-------|
| John Manning    | NANPA |
| Jean-Paul Emard | ATIS  |

Commission Employees:

Sanford Williams, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)  
Pam Slipakoff, Alternate DFO  
Jennifer Gorny, Alternate DFO  
Deborah Blue, Special Assistant to the DFO  
Diane Griffin, Assistant Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau  
Cheryl Callahan, Assistant Chief, Telecommunications Access Policy Division

**III. Estimate of Public Attendance.** Approximately 30 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

**IV. Documents Introduced.**

- (1) Agenda
- (2) January 22, 2003 NANC Meeting Minutes
- (3) December 11, 2002 NANC Conference Call Meeting Minutes
- (4) NANPA Report to the NANC
- (5) Status of Area Code Relief Exhausting within 36 Months
- (6) National Thousands Block Number Pooling Services Report
- (7) Numbering Oversight Working Group Report
- (8) Abbreviated Dialing for One Call Notification IMG
- (9) INC Report to the NANC
- (10) LNPA Working Group Status Report to the NANC
- (11) Wireless Number Portability Operations Status Report to the NANC
- (12) Letter from Robert Atkinson to the NANC Members regarding FCC Request for Advice on Use of Working Telephone Numbers to Assess Contributions to the Universal Service Fund
- (13) NANPA Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection
- (14) ENUM Presentation by Tom McGarry, NeuStar

**V. Summary of the Meeting.**

**A. Announcements and Recent News.** Sanford Williams, Designated Federal Officer, welcomed Hoke Knox as the new NANC Co-Chair. Mr. Williams stated that Chairman Atkinson was running late and that Mr. Knox would be starting the meeting. Mr. Williams welcomed Christopher Bowe as the alternate for Nextel; Michele Thomas as the alternate for T-Mobile USA; Daniel Phythyon as the primary member for USTA; Thomas Soroka as the alternate for USTA; and Josephine Gallagher as the alternate for Verizon. He advised that on February 21, 2003, the FCC released a Public Notice announcing a month-to-month extension of the terms of administration for NBANC and the NANPA. Mr. Williams advised that an additional item (Item #13) would be added to the Agenda relating to a Report and Order issued by the FCC on December 13, 2002 seeking comment on the feasibility of using working telephone numbers to assess Universal Service Fund Contributions. Mr. Williams indicated that the FCC would like the NANC to look at that issue.

**B. Approval of Meeting Minutes.** The December 11, 2002 NANC Conference Call Meeting Minutes were approved. The January 22, 2003 NANC Meeting Minutes were approved.

**C. North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA) Report to the NANC.** John Manning, NANPA, provided the report to the Council.

Central Office Code (CO) Activity Report. Mr. Manning reported that the total number of assignments in 2003 were 615 codes. The net assignments were 222 codes. Mr. Manning stated that a number of codes are still being returned. He noted that in comparing the first two months of 2003 with the last two months of 2002, assignments are up approximately 130 codes. Mr. Manning stated that there has been a slight increase compared to the previous two months. He advised that NANPA will monitor the assignment rates. If any other trends are beginning to develop, NANPA will report them to the NANC.

NPA Relief Planning Report. Mr. Manning reported that five NPA codes are currently projected to exhaust with the next 12 months: (1) West Virginia 304 – projected to exhaust in the first quarter of 2004. Mr. Manning stated that positive impacts of pooling have been experienced in this NPA because a large number of carriers are participating in voluntary pooling. He indicated that this data suggests that the 304 NPA exhaust will be extended beyond the first quarter of 2004. (2) California 310 – as of March 17, 2003, there were 8 NXX codes available for assignment. Mr. Manning stated that rationing is still in place, but NANPA has not made any assignments since the commencement of wireless pooling. (3) California 909 – as of March 17, 2003, there were 13 NXX codes available for assignment. Mr. Manning stated that there has been one assignment, and one or two codes have been returned or their return is pending. He indicated that the actual timeframe when NPA codes 909 and 310 will exhaust is dependent upon demand and whether or not the rationing levels are reached. (4) Pennsylvania 484/610 – Mr. Manning stated when NPA 484/610 is within 10 months of exhaust, the PSC and NANPA will move forward with the implementation of an overlay code. He advised that since that there have been a significant number of codes returned, it is likely that exhaust will be extended beyond the next year. (5) Connecticut 860 – as of March 17, 2003, there were 36 NXX codes available for assignment. Mr. Manning stated that rationing is in place at 7 NXX codes per month, but the rationing level has not been reached for quite some time. He indicated that based upon current assignment rates, the 860 NPA exhaust could extend beyond the first quarter of 2004.

Mr. Manning reported that NANPA has received over 5,300 submissions associated with the February 1, 2003 submission cycle. He noted that these include new submissions, revised submissions that provide corrections to errors identified during processing, and updates to previously submitted information. Mr. Manning advised that NANPA is in the process of formulating the service provider-specific data to state commissions. He further advised that NANPA is targeting the May 13, 2003 NANC meeting for the release of the new NPA exhaust projections.

Thomas Soroka, USTA, inquired as to what would happen if a state were to run out of numbers in a certain NPA. Mr. Manning stated that NANPA can only assign what it has. Loretta Lynch, NARUC, stated that California is monitoring the situations very closely in the NPAs where there are fewer codes than others. She advised that it is monitored on a bi-weekly basis. Ms. Lynch noted that California has several pending applications at the FCC which would give California additional numbers for the pool. She stated that pooling has worked in California, specifically in the 310 NPA. Ms. Lynch further stated

that the NANC had projected that the 310 NPA would exhaust in 1999. She indicated that as of 2003, California has over 600,000 numbers available in the pool and countless numbers stranded, despite the 10 percent contamination threshold, which California has asked the FCC to increase to 25 percent. Ms. Lynch stated that if the FCC were to grant California's petitions, which have been pending since September 2002, and wireless carriers were to move to LNP capability, without another delay in November 2003, California is capable of managing these numbers quite effectively. She noted that the take-up rate for February 2003 was eight one thousand number blocks in NPA 310. Michael O'Connor, Verizon, questioned how industry can be certain that numbers will be available as needed in California. Ms. Lynch suggested that he come in and talk to the CPUC, which has people dedicated to area code and numbering issues in California who would be happy to meet with him.

Assignment of NPA 684 to American Samoa. Mr. Manning reported that on January 24, 2003, NANPA assigned the 684 NPA to American Samoa. Mr. Manning advised that a number of committees have been formed to address specific issues including: contact information, implementation activities, technical issues, and customer education issues. He also reported on the following activities for NPA 684:

- March 3, 2003 - NANPA conducted the Initial Implementation Meeting for the 684 NPA (there were approximately 30 representatives on the call)
- March 24, 2003 - The NANPA Planning Letter will be published
- October 2, 2004 - Permissive dialing begins
- April 2, 2005 - Mandatory dialing begins
- April 2, 2007 - There will be a Recorded Announcement Period of approximately two years

2002 NANPA Annual Report. Mr. Manning stated that the 2002 NANPA Annual Report is available online on the NANPA website. He further stated that the expected mailing date for the report is early April 2003.

**D. Presentation by National Thousands-Block Pooling Administrator (PA).**

Barry Bishop, NeuStar, provided the report to the Council. Mr. Bishop stated that since the implementation of the national rollout began on January 4, 2002, there have been 80 First Implementation Meetings (FIMs) for 122 NPAs (including overlays and splits in permissive dialing). The FIMs for the 5<sup>th</sup> Quarter of the rollout schedule were completed on February 5, 2003. Implementation meetings for the 6<sup>th</sup> Quarter of the rollout begin on March 18 and end on May 7. Mr. Bishop reported that the Tennessee 731 NPA has been added to the 7<sup>th</sup> Quarter rollout schedule.

Mr. Bishop reported that one new Change Order was filed with the FCC on February 13, 2003. Change Order #17 – LNPA Issue #335 – AOCNs Performing Initial Thousands Block Entries into BIRRDs” and LNPA Issue #389 – Change Minimum Expedite Thousands Block Effective Date. This Change Order effectively replaces Change Order #16. He stated that there are 8 other Change Orders that are outstanding.

Mr. Bishop reported that for January 2003, 2307 applications were approved; 229 applications were denied; and 142 applications were suspended. For February 2003, 2035 applications were approved; 235 applications were denied; and 283 applications were suspended. Mr. Bishop reported that for the months of February 2003 and March 2003, the Pooling Administration System (PAS) availability has been at 100 percent.

Mr. Bishop reported that the modified Unassigned Number Porting (UNP) trial began in the Connecticut 203 and 860 NPAs on November 1, 2002. A conference call was held on March 4, 2003. The trial was postponed as there were not enough participants on the call. Another call has been scheduled for March 25, 2003.

Mr. Bishop stated that the PA had an action assignment from the January 2003 NANC meeting to track the frequency and report the trend of problems caused by intra-Service Provider (SP) porting on contaminated number blocks. He reported that there were 68 cases of trouble reported from December 2002 to date. Mr. Bishop stated that of the 68 cases, 10 Service providers were affected. Fifty five percent of the trouble cases were directly caused by intra-SP ports not being completed. The other 45% were due to a variety of issues where blocks were over contaminated or not opened for portability in the NPAC, etc. NeuStar as the PA, and AT&T Wireless brought in a PIM to the LNPA WG to be discussed at the April 2003 LNPA WG meeting. Mark Welch, SBC, commented that he did not want the NANC to think that all of the issues are self-induced problems. Mr. Welch expressed hope that the industry will be able to look at those situations and work with the NANPA and the PA to tighten up how everything operates.

Mr. Bishop reported that an issue regarding the need for multiple Local Routing Numbers (LRNs) is currently being worked by the LNPA WG. He stated that it is very important for the PA to be notified about Rate Center Consolidations, either by state commission orders or tariff filings. The Central Office Code Administration Guidelines, Section 6.3.4 states that in the absence of state commission actions, SPs who file tariffs for a rate center consolidation must notify NANPA and the PA at the time of the filing. Mr. Bishop emphasized that petitions that affect pooling should reference NeuStar as the Thousands Block Pooling Administrator or National Pooling Administrator, and not the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA).

Mr. Bishop stated that the PA delivered the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter 2002 User Survey to the FCC. It consists of the following components: Summary, Level of Satisfaction, Team Recognition, Individual Recognition, Pooling Administration System, Improvement, and Other Comments. He stated that 64 surveys were returned. The lowest score on the surveys was for the PAS system.

**E. Number Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report.** Karen Mulberry, WorldCom, presented the report to the Council.

2002 NANPA Performance Report Status. Ms. Mulberry reported that the NOWG has requested additional time to complete the report. She advised that the NOWG previewed preliminary data with the FCC and NANPA on March 4, 2003, and that the NOWG's

information gathering is complete. The final report is scheduled to be distributed to the NANC by May 5, 2003. The NOWG would like to formally present its findings to the NANC at the May 13, 2003 NANC meeting. Ms. Mulberry reported on information that has been gathered to date by the NOWG from the 2002 survey responses, and she noted that more responses were received than in previous years. Ms. Mulberry thanked everyone for their participation. She expressed appreciation to the NANPA for their assistance in posting the survey on the NANPA website.

Status of 2002 NANPA Performance Improvement Plan (PIP). Ms. Mulberry reported that the 2003 PIP will be developed upon completion of the NANPA's 2002 Annual Performance Report.

PA Change Order #17 Recommendation. Ms. Mulberry reported that Change Order #17 was submitted on February 13, 2003. She advised that it replaces Change Order #16. Ms. Mulberry stated that the NOWG recommended to the FCC on February 24, 2003, that the Change Order be accepted. She further stated that based on the NOWG's recommendation, the NOWG would assume that Change Order #16 would then be denied or withdrawn.

Randy Sanders, BellSouth questioned whether the Change Orders are actually in effect. Ms. Mulberry responded that the FCC determines the next steps. Mr. Williams advised that the FCC will incorporate the NOWG's recommendations into its final decision. Chairman Atkinson stated that it would be helpful if the NANC could get some feedback to find out the fate of the Change Orders and how quickly the process is working. Mr. Williams advised that the FCC will inform the NANC once it has made a final decision. He further advised that the Contracting Officer has been out for approximately a month. Mr. Williams stated that all of the Change Orders, including the outstanding ones, should be resolved shortly.

PAS Semi-Annual Forecasting Report. Ms. Mulberry stated that on January 29, 2003, a carrier reported a dispute with the PA about how semi-annual forecasts may be submitted, and the dispute was referred to the NOWG to investigate. The NOWG is reviewing the issue and hopes to have a report in a few weeks. It will then be forwarded to the NANC for review.

Ms. Mulberry reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule with the NANC members.

Mr. Bishop inquired who the dispute was reported to. Ms. Mulberry stated she believes that an email was sent to Mr. Williams and Chairman Atkinson. She further stated that Chairman Atkinson referred it to the NOWG for investigation. Mr. Bishop stated that the PA was not made aware of it.

Mr. Manning advised that there is going to be another CAS survey. NANPA is accelerating its work on the discrepancies between the CAS, the Local Exchange Routing Guide (LERG), and NANPA records to try and determine exactly whether or not a code is in service. Mr. Manning explained that it will ultimately improve the CAS records and

eliminate discrepancies with the LERG, which will make more codes available for Service Providers. Mr. Manning indicated that NANPA has plans to help the states with the NRUF database. NANPA plans to have some conference calls in late April with the states as a refresher on the NRUF database and some of the additional tools that have been added since the first training session approximately 1 ½ years ago. NANPA has plans to put together some user groups on CAS, to get input on the system directly from Service Providers. NANPA plans to have another training session before the July submission cycle to help educate Service Providers about filling out the NRUF Form 502.

**F. Report of the 3-Digit DIG IMG.** Pamela Connell, AT&T, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Connell advised that there was discussion at the January 22, 2003 NANC meeting regarding the recently identified legislation for the 3-Digit Nationwide Toll-Free Numbering System. She further advised that an IMG was formed which consists of AT&T, SBC, Verizon, and WorldCom. Ms. Connell stated that other participants are most welcome. She noted that the IMG has received information from Dave Bench, Nortel Networks.

Ms. Connell stated that the IMG has had approximately three or four conference calls, and the IMG developed the following list of assumptions:

- the 3-digit number selected will translate into existing One Call numbers in the states
- the implementation will be uniform across the country
- the implementation can not start until official governmental timelines are provided
- the Originating NPA/NXX will determine the route of the call
- and wireline will not implement a number using a star (\*) or a pound (#)

Ms. Connell advised that the FCC and the Department of Transportation (DOT) were discussing this issue. Mr. Williams stated that once the FCC meets with the DOT, the FCC will likely be issuing an NPRM. Cheryl Callahan, Assistant Chief, Telecommunications Access Policy Division, advised that the FCC is coordinating with the DOT on the appropriate vehicle for implementing the legislation. Mr. Sanders questioned whether there would be any problems with porting. Mr. Bench questioned whether all states have a single reporting number. Ms. Connell responded most but not all. Mr. Bench questioned whether they are all toll-free numbers. Ms. Connell responded no.

Ms. Connell stated that the IMG developed some questions and circulated them among the membership for comment. She indicated that to date, no feedback or comments have been received for the following questions:

- Question 1 - The timeframe for implementation. Does the one year requirement stated in the PL107-355 apply to FCC/DOT action or actual deployment by carriers?

- Question 2 – Must the dialing sequence for Wireline Service Providers be identical to that of Wireless Service Providers?
- Question 3 – If the \* or the # keys are part of the dialing sequence, will they count towards the three digit limit?
- Question 4 – What will be the process for states to purchase this service from carriers?

Chairman Atkinson stated that it would be very important to get from DOT and the FCC some indication in the near term about how they interpret this timing issue. He explained that if it is one year to actually establish a number (which is not what the statute says), then that raises a huge issue. Chairman Atkinson stated that he would make an action assignment to try and get some indication from the FCC and the DOT about their statutory interpretation.

Ms. Connell emphasized that the IMG needs some clarification before it can proceed with any substantial work. She stated that based on the initial discussions, there are two alternatives that may be the quickest to implement: (1) 811, since Intra-Carrier use of 811 is relatively de minimis at this point. (2) The Easily Recognizable Code (ERC), the IMG has identified that code as 344.

Mr. Sanders questioned who the NANC could consult with about this issue. Mr. Williams stated that once the FCC has discussions with the DOT, the FCC should be able to answer the NANC's questions regarding this.

Phil McClelland inquired as to whether this is going to be a service designed at the federal level or at the state level. He expressed concern that the states will be given another numbering task without a lot of guidance. Chairman Atkinson commented that the unfortunate thing about the Act is that it actually gives the primary responsibility to the DOT to design a telecommunications system. Ms. Callahan stated that the FCC has similar questions that are being discussed internally. She indicated that the FCC intends to have further discussions with the DOT. Ms. Callahan pointed out that some of what the FCC and the DOT will be doing is figuring out how to continue to use the systems that are already in place and translating those numbers into abbreviated dialing codes. She advised that as the FCC explores these issues with the DOT, the NANC will hear more from the FCC in terms of the procedure for accomplishing this.

Mr. Bench stated that from a wireline perspective, implementing the act is fairly easy to do. He cautioned not to play with the \* and the # keys because in the wireline industry, the \* and # are defined. Mr. Bench stated that from a wireless perspective, there is an issue about how wireless interfaces with the network. He expressed concern about the proliferation of this type of service. Mr. Bench advised that there are a lot of technical issues that need to be worked out if the service will be universal for wireless and wireline providers. He emphasized that from a wireless perspective, this gets extremely complicated when trying to pinpoint the physical location of the wireless customer when he makes the call, just like 911 today. Chairman Atkinson urged the IMG to keep documenting the range of the issues that this raises. He proposed that the IMG put the

concerns and issues in writing, and he will forward them to the Chief of the Wireline Competition Bureau. Chairman Atkinson presumed that the industry is going to move along as quickly as possible to implement these changes. Mr. Knox stated that he would like to join in with Mr. Bench's comments and express concern about the cell sites and the major trading areas crossing state boundaries and how to get to the right state department of transportation with a call. He added that Sprint would like to add a representative to the IMG. Michelle Thomas, T-Mobile stated that T-Mobile is dealing with the issue of abbreviated dialing with numerous highway authorities throughout the country in relation to pilot programs on 511, which is already a designated abbreviated code for the DOT. She implied that this issue is related to 511 as well. Ms. Thomas indicated that she would like to be involved with the IMG, and share some information about what T-Mobile is dealing with - a proliferation of abbreviated codes for highway-specific issues that the wireless industry is currently grappling with. Chairman Atkinson opined that the input will be very helpful.

**G. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report.** Dana Smith, INC Moderator, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Smith reviewed the INC meeting schedule with the NANC. She stated that at the January 22, 2003 NANC meeting, INC was asked to report activities within its new VoIP Workshop. Ms. Smith reported that the INC convened its first working meeting on March 5, 2003. A new Associate Workshop Membership category was established to gain some additional VoIP Service Providers and allow them to participate in the Workshop without having to join INC. Two VoIP Service Providers have become associate members. There has been initial discussion on VoIP service arrangements and their impact on NANP numbers. Seven new contributions were presented. Consensus has not been reached whether there are any numbering issues; and if so, if they are unique to VoIP. Ms. Smith reported that INC has discussed proposed modifications to the NRUF Form 502. If the FCC considers making changes to the form, INC would like to share its expertise and participate in the modification process. Ms. Smith reviewed the INC Issue Summary for Active Workshops. She pointed out that INC had one new issue go into final closure. A PA Change Order will be generated from it this issue.

**H. Local Number Portability Report (LNPA).** Gary Sacra, Verizon, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Sacra stated that the NPAC Release 3.2 project plan remains on track. The Service Provider (SP) Turn-up Testing, which is currently underway, is scheduled to be completed on May 14, 2003. The Regions have now been assigned their rollout slots. The first production date for the Midwest Region is May 19, 2003. On June 2, 2003, the Mid-Atlantic, Southeast, and Southwest Regions will turn up production. The final production date is June 16, 2003 for the Northeast, West Coast, and Western Regions. Mr. Sacra reported that the Architecture Planning Team (AP Team) is a newly-formed sub-team of the LNPA Working Group. He advised that its mission is to assess current number portability technical issues and the future projected porting volumes and determine what, if any, number portability architectural changes may be appropriate. Mr. Sacra indicated that the current focus of the AP Team is mainly on two areas:

(1) the SP use of past NPAC Change Orders (Change Orders that are related to performance) or enhancements that have been implemented. The Goal is to determine if the failure to implement any of those Change Orders on the part of any SP's in some way is impacting or will impact the overall number portability performance;

(2) detailed requirements for new NANC Change Orders that are designed to improve interface performance.

The AP Team will continue to meet on Tuesday afternoon during LNPA week.

Mr. Sanders inquired which companies are on the AP Team. Mr. Sacra responded that Bell South, Verizon, MCI, and AT&T are on the AP Team. He further responded that a significant portion of the LNPA Working Group and vendors attend the AP Team meetings.

Mr. Sacra reviewed the Problem Identification and Management (PIM) report with the Council.

Mr. Sacra reported that at the January 22, 2003 NANC meeting, an issue was raised by the PA regarding Service Providers that were requesting additional NXX codes for LRN assignments. He stated that the LNPA agreed to discuss the issue for possible resolution or perhaps a deferral to another industry group. Mr. Sacra advised that the LNPA is in the process of soliciting contributions from those Service Providers detailing their requirements. He further advised that the LNPA is developing a matrix containing scenarios, identifying potential solutions, and which industry forum, if applicable, should address particular scenarios.

Mr. Sacra reported that an issue was raised at the LNPA involving SP's donating 1K blocks to the industry pool and not enabling LNP functionality in their donor switch. He advised that this prevents SP's from performing the "query-of-last-resort." Mr. Sacra indicated that INC's Pooling Administration Guidelines currently address this SP responsibility. He stated that the LNPA will ask the Pooling Administrator to distribute an appropriate advisory to all SP's detailing their responsibilities as the LERG-assignee when they donate 1K blocks to the pool. Mr. Sacra advised that the LNPA is just raising NANC's awareness of this issue.

Wireless Number Portability Operations (WNPO) Report to the NANC. Sean Hawkins, AT&T Wireless, presented the report to the Council. Mr. Hawkins reported that the WNPO and the Wireless Testing Subcommittee (WTSC) met on Monday, March 10 and Tuesday, March 11, 2003. He stated that the team focused on updating the InterCarrier testing schedule in order to meet the porting mandate for November 24, 2003. Mr. Hawkins advised that the WTSC and the Wireless Workshop (WICIS) are working on creating joint test cases for InterCarrier Process (ICP) for end-to-end testing cases. He indicated that additional carriers are in the process of establishing ICP test schedules.

Mr. Hawkins noted that WTSC is composing a letter to encourage more participation from wireline carriers, and Tier 2 and Tier 3 wireless carriers for ICP testing.

The WNPO reviewed and updated the WNPO Action Items & Issues List and the WNPO Decision/Recommendation Matrix.

New Business: Mr. Hawkins reported on Block Donation Multiple Issues. He indicated that this is a contribution from the AWS and the PA involving failed inter-Service Provider ports, received blocks that exceed contamination, contaminated blocks, and the potential impact upon customers when the guidelines are not followed. Mr. Hawkins advised that this has been submitted to the LNPA-WG as a PIM and will be addressed at the April 2003 LNPA meeting. He reported on Porting and Pooling of Non-Migrated Type 1 Numbers. Mr. Hawkins stated that agreement was reached that changes to the Reseller Notification, Figure 13 of the NANC provisioning flows, were appropriate to accommodate non-migrated Type 1 numbers. The changes leading up to Figure 13 were made and referred to the LNPA-WG.

Appropriate revisions to the narratives will be discussed at the April 2003 LNPA-WG meeting. The WNPO agreed to stop reviewing call flows at its meetings, but to continue reviewing call flows through the LNPA-WG unless a change in a flow directly impacts wireless carriers (such as rolling Type 1 into the reseller flows). At that time, WTSC will review changes and forward them to the LNPA-WG. Mr. Hawkins reported that NeuStar presented their report with no new wireless NPAC users. He noted that there are currently 56 wireless NPAC users. Mr. Hawkins further reported that the NENA representative gave a very brief report and urged that InterCarrier WNP network testing and ICP testing with wireless and wireline carriers, including the 911 test scenarios in the national test plan, should continue. He indicated that continued testing may help identify additional 911 issues.

Ms. Lynch questioned whether wireline carriers were participating in the testing. Mr. Hawkins responded that several wireline carriers are participating and in the desire to have the best possible outcome, the WNPO is asking that everyone participate. Ms. Lynch further questioned whether it will slow up readiness. Mr. Hawkins responded no. Chairman Atkinson inquired whether everything is on track for November 24, 2003. Mr. Hawkins responded yes.

**I. Universal Service Fund (USF).** Chairman Atkinson stated that he sent a memo to the NANC Members, dated March 7, 2003, summarizing what the NANC had been asked to do by the FCC regarding one of a number of proposals that have been made for developing a new mechanism to assess USF contributions. He pointed out that one of the proposals has been to base every SP's USF assessment on their working telephone numbers. Chairman Atkinson stated that working telephone numbers are reasonably clear to track or audit. He stated this method may also include some of the new technologies and other services that utilize phone numbers and, therefore, make sure that USF Fund charges are assessed fairly and broadly. Chairman Atkinson stated that the memo laid out paragraph 99 from the December 13, 2002 FCC Second Further Notice of

Proposed Rulemaking. He pointed out that there are approximately seven specific questions in paragraph 99, and that the FCC staff asked the NANC to look at these questions and six additional questions. Chairman Atkinson stated that as indicated in his memo, his expectation is that if the NANC thinks that it should take a next step, the NANC will establish an IMG and have some experts review those questions and report back to the NANC. The NANC will then provide a consensus recommendation to the FCC. He stated that he would want to understand the FCC's timeframe so that the NANC can get a recommendation to the FCC in a timely fashion.

The NANC proceeded with broad discussion regarding reaction to the idea of using phone numbers as the basis for assessing USF contributions. Chairman Atkinson inquired as to the deadline for NANC consensus. Eric Einhorn, Chief of the Telecommunications Access Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, advised that the Comment date had already passed. He indicated that Reply Comments are due by mid-April 2003. Mr. Einhorn stated that if the NANC feels that it needs more time than April 2003, the NANC may submit an ex parte or just file a letter with the FCC, and it would be treated as an ex parte. Chairman Atkinson stated that at this stage, the NANC should be able to meet the April date. He questioned whether any of the NANC members felt that it is impossible to meet the April date.

Ms. Mulberry advised that if the NANC is to furnish something to the FCC by the April date, the NANC will have to schedule an interim conference call to review whatever work will be provided. Chairman Atkinson proposed that an IMG be established to put together a report. The IMG will circulate the report by email to the NANC members and then, have a conference call.

Mr. O'Connor opined that there are some things in the memo that the NANC is uniquely qualified to help with and some things that, in terms of assessing the validity of the proposal, are outside the expertise of the NANC. Chairman Atkinson stated that if the FCC were to adopt the proposal the dollar amount would be divided by some number of working telephone numbers, and whomever is responsible for those telephone numbers would make their proportion of the USF contributions. Chairman Atkinson stated that the NANC's expertise comes in the area of whether, mechanically, the numbers line up so that the bill can effectively be sent to the right carrier.

Mr. Soroka stated that USTA has a few concerns. He explained that USTA supports a connection based USF contribution methodology, i.e., it seeks parity across all Service Providers that provide end-users with telephone numbers. Mr. Soroka stated that using the telephone number methodology would put a huge burden on ILECs because ILECs are assignees of most of the phone numbers in the country. He further stated that USTA is concerned that ported numbers would be very difficult to track. Mr. Soroka stated that USTA supports more of a retail relationship based contribution method as opposed to a telephone number method. Chairman Atkinson remarked that Mr. Soroka's first comment that it would put a huge burden under the ILECs would not be an issue that the NANC would address, because it is a policy decision, and the NANC would never get a consensus on it. Chairman Atkinson stated that Mr. Soroka's second comment on ported

numbers being difficult to track is exactly the kind of issue that the NANC should address.

Mr. Knox questioned if the NANC were to form an IMG, whether it would be looking into what a working number is and whether it includes what type of number is assigned, e.g., administrative or intermediate. Chairman Atkinson stated that he interprets from the term “working” that the FCC is looking for revenue producing telephone numbers. Mr. Knox pointed out that there are some telephone numbers which are working, but not producing revenue. Chairman Atkinson suggested that the IMG could think about this. Mr. Knox questioned whether it is a quarterly, monthly, or semiannual report. Mr. Einhorn responded that carriers pay monthly and report quarterly. Chairman Atkinson suggested that the IMG could look at the least burdensome audit time frame.

Ms. O’Donnell questioned whether the NANC is supposed to discuss how to deal with carriers who do not have telephone numbers. She stated that if the NANC is only looking at the telephone numbers, it does not work. Mr. Williams stated that the FCC would like for the NANC to focus on the proposal strictly in paragraph 99 so that the FCC can see what expertise it can lend to the proceeding from that viewpoint. Chairman Atkinson stated that the NANC is supposed to answer the questions whether assigning the USF contribution methodology on the basis of working telephone numbers can be done, and what details in a rule would make it work better or worse. He explained that the NANC is supposed to address efficiency, feasibility, and accuracy issues. Phil McClelland, NASUCA, stated that in the past, there was a group in the NANC that submitted a report on charging for telephone numbers. He opined that a lot of the same administrative and policy issues were also dealt with in that report. Mr. McClelland proposed that, if the IMG is really trying to evaluate the policy in the context of number conservation, it should consider all of the numbers that are taken out of the public domain and not just assigned and working numbers.

Ms. Lynch stated that she agrees with Ms. O’Donnell about the need to look at alternatives that may be more workable within the context of numbering proposals and not beat around the bush. She further stated that she also agrees with Mr. McClelland that a by-product of the FCC moving to this framework should be number conservation. Ms. Lynch disagreed with Chairman Atkinson that the NANC would only want to logically connect it to revenue producing numbers. She noted that the California PUC has done six audits of actual number inventories of six different companies. Ms. Lynch indicated that they found that it was very difficult to determine what numbers were in the reserved, administrative, and intermediate categories. She stated that the majority of the companies did not keep good records. Ms. Lynch advised that before trying to determine what numbers are in and what numbers are out, the NANC needs to consult with companies about their inventories. Chairman Atkinson stated that part of the NANC’s fundamental Charter is promoting number conservation and the efficient use of numbers.

Mr. Welch questioned whether it would be appropriate for the NANC to evaluate impacts to the consumers because reserved numbers were not set aside out of goodwill, it was out

of requests from a customer. Chairman Atkinson stated that those are the kind of thoughts that the NANC needs to capture and include in its report.

Ms. Mickiewicz stated that the FCC opened the numbering docket in June 1999. In June 2000, it issued its First Report and Order. Attached to the First Report and Order was a Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in which the FCC asked for comment on a fee for numbers proposal. Ms. Mickiewicz stated that the proposal was not very clearly spelled out. She added that most parties that filed comments vehemently opposed the idea. In its Second Report and Order, issued in December 2000, the FCC asked for more input. Ms. Mickiewicz stated that the second round of comments was very similar to the first round of comments. She indicated that the FCC did not speak to the issue in its Third Report and Order, and that it kicked the issue to the Universal Service Docket, which is where we are now.

Mr. Einhorn stated that the discussion was very useful, and it would be helpful to have any thoughts from the NANC that could be added to the record. He expressed appreciation for the NANC looking at this issue.

It was decided that an IMG be formed. Volunteers include: WorldCom, Verizon, T-Mobile, Sprint, OPATSCO, SBC, Nextel, NCTA, NARUC – Connecticut, NARUC-California, CTIA, NeuStar to be available as an ex officio member to provide some support to the Committee, BellSouth, and AT&T. Mary Ricker, Qwest, respectfully requested that Qwest be allowed to serve. Chairman Atkinson responded yes. He stated that he would serve as an observer to help the Chair and make sure that the IMG does not get into policy discussions. Mr. O'Connor volunteered to serve as Chair. Chairman Atkinson asked that volunteers send an email to Mr. O'Connor and copy him on the e-mail. He stated that the IMG will be focusing on paragraph 99 as supplemented by the additional questions asked by the FCC. Chairman Atkinson stated that the goal is to try and get something back to the FCC by April 15, 2003. If needed, a conference call will be scheduled for April 14, 2003.

**J. VoIP Discussion on Use of Numbers.** Chairman Atkinson stated that at the January 22, 2003 NANC meeting there was discussion on VoIP, and a presentation was given by Vonage digitalvoice. He indicated that some of the NANC members requested additional time to consider any next steps or how to conclude the discussion. It was decided that the VoIP discussion would be continued at the March 19, 2003 meeting. Chairman Atkinson stated that the question is whether the NANC should put this issue aside or actively do something.

Mr. Knox stated that Sprint's concern about using numbers may or may not apply to the NANC. He stated that Sprint's concern is if it bypasses access and is a phone-to-phone type call thereby using up numbering resources. Mr. Knox questioned whether it should be addressed by the NANC or the FCC. Ms. Mickiewicz stated that at the January NANC meeting, the Vonage representative was asked how carriers that assign Vonage numbers report those numbers. She recollected that the answer was that they are treated as assigned numbers. Ms. Mickiewicz stated that that is not true in all cases. She stated

that the California PUC has been informed by Focal Communications, which provides Vonage with numbers in California, that Focal treats these numbers as intermediate numbers. Ms. Mickiewicz stated that this matters because of the whole discussion that the NANC had about intermediate numbers. She indicated that California and Michigan are concerned that when a carrier gives numbers to a non-carrier entity, the non-carrier entity has no NRUF requirement, and it does not have to report its usage. Ms. Mickiewicz stated that if Focal Communications is not reporting how those numbers are used by Vonage, then nobody is reporting them. They just show up as intermediate numbers in Focal's inventory. Chairman Atkinson advised that this issue is being pursued at INC. He stated that one of the options was for the NANC to wait for the INC report. Mr. Bench stated that Vonage has been very upfront with the NANC. He advised that Vonage has become participants in INC and are full-fledged members of INC. Mr. Bench remarked that Vonage made a very nice presentation and agreed with Chairman Atkinson that the NANC should wait for the INC report.

It was decided that the NANC will not have VoIP on the Agenda as a specific item until it hears from INC or unless someone thinks that there is a need to put it back on the agenda.

**K. NBANC Report.** Maripat Brennan, NBANC, presented the report to the Council. Ms. Brennan reported that as of February 28, 2003, the current fund balance is \$4.23 Million. She advised that the actual balance, which includes the amount of money that NBANC has reserved for future requirements, is approximately \$9.8 Million. Ms. Brennan stated that NBANC has received approximately \$8.4 Million in contributions. She indicated that NBANC has paid out approximately \$6.9 Million. Ms. Brennan stated that NBANC is projecting an end-of-year balance of approximately \$6.7 Million. She noted that there is a settlement agreement between NeuStar and the FCC in which NBANC has paid NeuStar \$825,330.61. Ms. Brennan explained this was paid to NeuStar for additional funding that they had requested in July 2000 for work above and beyond what they had originally agreed to do in the contract, and for additional compensation going forward. Ms. Brennan reported that for Pooling Administration, there is still a balance of approximately \$616 Thousand. NBANC has been keeping track of that separately until there is a decision on a contract award to NeuStar that could be paid out for the first year of the contract. NBANC has paid out approximately \$1.3 Million for this contract period to NeuStar for 1K Block Pooling. \$177 Thousand has been paid for Carrier Audits. Ms. Brennan reported that \$203,000 has been set aside for a couple of years for COCUS Replacement. She explained that because COCUS Replacement went hand-in-glove with the settlement between NeuStar and the FCC, there will no longer be a balance under COCUS Replacement for this year. She reported that the MITRE Corporation contract is now up to \$338,000. Out of that, \$192,000 has been paid. \$208,000 has been paid to NECA. NBANC's Board expenses are approximately \$3,000. Ms. Brennan stated that NBANC completed its external audit and paid its auditors \$28,600.

Ms. Brennan noted that the FCC extended the terms of administration for NeuStar as the NANPA and NBANC as the billing and collection agent for numbering administration.

She stated that the extensions are on a month-to-month basis until terminated in writing by the FCC. Both entities are being compensated at their current rate unless modified by the FCC in writing. Ms. Brennan stated that just about all of the NANPA dollars are invested in a cash management type fund with approximately 1.25% interest being accumulated.

**L. ENUM Developments Briefing.** Tom McGarry, NeuStar, presented the report to the Council. Chairman Atkinson informed the NANC members that the FCC Chairman had written a letter to the Department of Commerce about ENUM. Chairman Atkinson noted that ENUM has been discussed at previous NANC meetings. He advised that he had asked NeuStar to give the NANC an update on ENUM so that the NANC can understand whether or not ENUM will have some impact on the NANC's work.

Mr. McGarry explained how ENUM works. He stated that ENUM takes an E.164 telephone number and turns it into an Internet domain name. E.164 is the ITU standard that defines the structure of a telephone number. Mr. McGarry stated that ENUM is a domain name. Domain names have the most significant information on the right side and the least significant information on the left. That is the opposite of a telephone number. When you create a domain name out of a telephone number, the +1 moves to the right side, and the last digit moves to the left side. The Domain Name System (DNS) is the infrastructure that supports addressing (i.e., routing) for the Internet. Mr. McGarry explained why telephone numbers are turned into domain names. He also explained that many of the devices that are traditionally addressed by telephone numbers are becoming Internet-enabled, e.g., telephones and fax machines. Mr. McGarry advised that in order to understand ENUM, one should understand DNS first. Mr. McGarry reviewed the DNS infrastructure with the Council. He also reviewed the following DNS Issues Inherited by ENUM with the Council: Privacy, Rights of existing name holders, and Selection of Registry.

Mr. Sanders questioned why Chairman Powell is interested in ENUM. Mr. Williams stated that ENUM is something that has taken hold in the ITU, has been looked at internationally, and is something that the United States Government decided that it wants to pursue. He stated that the question from the U.S. Government perspective is what role it will play and what effect it will have. Mr. Williams advised that this issue is yet to be determined, and is being evaluated right now. Mr. McGarry stated that the greater good is convergence. He further stated that the network is moving that way by transitioning from a circuit switch network to a packet switch network. Ms. Mulberry opined that it would make the current telephone numbers in the United States more efficient. Chairman Atkinson inquired as to whether the NANC has an ongoing responsibility or interest in how the evolution of ENUM affects the NANC's Charter. He further inquired as to what the NANC needs to do, if anything, about ENUM in order to fulfill its role and responsibility. Ms. Mulberry stated that since the NANC Charter is associated with telephone numbers and not necessarily the internet addressing scheme, she is not sure that there is a role for the NANC right now.

Chairman Atkinson expressed concern that ENUM will have adverse impacts on the telephone system. He questioned whether there is a potential for overlap or conflict. Mr. Knox opined that there is an overlap because of number portability, disconnected numbers, the USF working number concept, and all of the rules associated with the use of numbers. He further opined that the NANC needs to get involved, potentially in the selection of a registry. Mr. Williams stated it would be premature for the NANC to get involved in terms of selecting a registry until a decision is made by the governmental agencies that are involved on what the next step will be. Mr. Welch agreed. He expressed hope that to the extent that the FCC becomes involved in ENUM, it will turn to the NANC as a group that is very educated in number administration, selection of industry administrators, portability, etc. Mr. Welch opined that the NANC has some expertise, and that it would be problematic if another agency were to start creating new rules that somehow contradict, for instance, the whole idea of moving a customer's number from one provider to another provider. He noted that the NANC already has measures in place and expressed hope that the NANC would be afforded an opportunity to leverage what it has already done in the PSTN to apply in this new world. Mr. O'Connor opined that the NANC needs periodic updates as ENUM develops. Mr. Bench stated that the NANC not only needs to understand how the PSTN numbering scheme fits into ENUM, but also needs to understand how the interconnection/inoperability is going to work, and who is going to stipulate the service standards. Chairman Atkinson proposed that Mr. McGarry come back to the NANC every six months to provide an update. He stated that if the industry or anyone else that is working on ENUM becomes aware of an issue that requires action, the NANC process can be used to help inform the FCC.

**M. Public Participation.** None.

**Next Meeting: May 13, 2003**

**Action Assignments:**

**March 19, 2003 NANC Meeting**

**1. NOWG**

Modify PA Change Order Tracking report to include dates of FCC action.

**2. DIG IMG**

Compile list of concerns, complexities and issues posed by DIG statute, to assist the FCC in discussions with the Department of Transportation.

**3. NASUCA – Pennsylvania**

Try to find old report on pros and cons of charging for telephone numbers as a conservation measure.